

ORDER

_____ This is an appeal from the trial court's revocation of appellant's probation and imposition of an eight-year sentence ordered to run consecutively to a fifteen-year Alabama sentence. After a thorough review of the record, it is the opinion of this Court that the judgment of the trial court should be affirmed pursuant to Rule 20, Tennessee Court of Criminal Appeals.

The appellant, William Hightower, pled guilty in 1988 to 69 counts of forgery. He was ordered to serve 180 days in the county jail and was placed on probation for a term of ten (10) years. In September 1994 he pled guilty in the State of Alabama to numerous counts of forgery and received a sentence of fifteen (15) years. A probation violation warrant filed in October 1994 alleged that Hightower received these Alabama convictions. Based upon the Alabama convictions the trial judge revoked Hightower's probation and ordered him to serve an effective eight-year sentence to run consecutively to the Alabama sentences.

Hightower's contention that the trial court erred by requiring the Tennessee sentences to be served consecutively to the Alabama sentences is without merit. The trial court is authorized to run such sentences consecutively pursuant to T.C.A. § 40-35-310. Consecutive sentencing is justified under the facts.

Hightower's contention that the trial court erred by not allowing a "deal" to be read into the record is likewise without merit. The deal apparently related to serving his Tennessee sentence before returning to Alabama. Hightower agreed at the conclusion of the hearing that it did not matter which sentence he served first.

The other issues raised by Hightower have either been waived and/or are not appropriate for our review.

The judgment of the trial court is affirmed pursuant to Rule 20, Tennessee Court of Criminal Appeals.

JOE G. RILEY, JUDGE

CONCUR:

JOE B. JONES, PRESIDING JUDGE

WILLIAM M. BARKER, JUDGE